Previous references.

1901.
(Separate Revenue

SA File No. 56/1901
Serial Nos. 1 to 5

Later references.

S R. 479/1906

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

Major ~~Part~~ B. for September 1903

SUBJECT

petition of Appeal dt 12th April 1902 from Timmala Naika of Harohalli Kankanhalli taluk against the Dy Comr's order confirming the Sale of certain lands in Yedamadu village Kankanahalli Taluk for arrears of excise Revenue.

Sl 1 From Timmala Naika of Harohalli
No 2881 dt 12th April 1902

petitioning for the restoration of a portion of his lands which was made over to the Gurkar Chikka Shimmappa in Feb 1900.

Sl 2 Do the Dy Comr Bangalore dist
No. 2149 dt. 26th May 1902.

Forwards the petition received with the above for submissi of the entire proceedings connected with the case together with a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

GPB—4,000—4-7-11

Sl 3. From the Dy Comr Bangalore Dist
No 522 18th Nov 1902.

Submits a repost on the petition of Thimmala Naik regarding a portion of his lands in Yedamadu Village Kankanahalli Taluk being made over to one Gurikar Thimmappa.

Sl 4. Do The Dy Comr Through the Excise Comr
No 284 23rd Sept 03.

Dismissing the appeal ~~preferred~~ preferred by Thimmala Naik of Harohalli Kankanhalli Taluk, against the Dy Comr's orders confirming the sale of certain lands in Yedamadu Village for arrears of excise revenue.

Sl 5. Do Thimmala Naik of Harohalli.
No 285. 19/23rd Sept 1903.

Informing him of the above.

Kanaji Narayana Rao
Asst Commissioner

under this Act, and under
Sec 187 of the Bombay Land
Rev Code the High Court
of Bombay have ruled
that ~~the~~ expression Land Revenue
as used in Act X of 1876
does not include either the duties
leviable ~~under Regn~~ x x x
on the manufacture of Spirits
or the taxes on the tapping &
boiling the toddy or sap in
certain districts was legalised
by

Act X of 1876 Sec 4 applies
only to Land Revenue and
that Abkari was always
regarded as distinct from
Land Revenue & that therefore
neither of the above Acts took
away the jurisdiction of the

of the Circuit Courts
in respect

Appeal No: 86 of 1902-1903

This is an appeal in connection with proceedings held for the recovery of excise revenue. The case has been posted for hearing by two Councillors under clause (b) of Rule 12 of the Rules of 8th. Aug. 1902. That clause relates to "claims connected with or arising out of any proceedings for the realization of land revenue", - an expression which is a reproduction of clause (c) of Section 221 of the Land Revenue Code. Under Section 193 of that Code excise revenue is leviable under the provisions relating to arrears of land revenue. But, though recoverable like land revenue, it is not land revenue ~~revenue~~ itself. The Bombay High Court have held that clause (c) of Section 4 of Bombay Act X of 1876 (which corresponds to S.221 (c) of our Revenue Regulation) does not take away the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts; and that it applies only to land revenue and not to abkari revenue, which latter is always regarded as distinct from land revenue (vide page 134 of Vol. I, Bombay Acts and Regulations by Jamietram and Chimanlal).

This seems to be the correct view of the matter. Claims connected with the realization of excise revenue being thus distinguishable from claims connected with the realization of land revenue, which latter alone the two Councillors are competent to hear and decide under para/2 of the Rules of Business, the Secretary will take such action as may be necessary for the disposal of this appeal.

Submitted to Secretary
May this be transferred to Excise Branch for disposal?
Dewar
3/8/03

Yes please & let me have a short clear note on merits
3/8/03

Rec'd on 10/8/03

M Jagannadha Rao

C Srinivasaraghavan
27-7-03.

at the rate of Rs 255/- per month; that out of Rs 2295/- due for 9 months, only Rs 680/- had been paid and that the said contractor had been constantly evading his liability on various frivolous pretexts. The Dy Comr thereupon ordered on 7.1.93 as follows:

"These are all idle excuses. I should take notice of them if arrears were paid up I promised to give them time for Rs 600/- of Rs 1000/- had been paid. They are unwilling. The lease should be cancelled. The Amildar thinks that this man is a hopeless man to deal with Govt will be addressed for the can

cancellation of the leases.
In the meantime, the
property of the defaulter
and the securities should
be proceeded against and
the results reported. The
shops may be allowed
to be worked by the defaulters
till the orders of Govt
are received, but arrange-
ments should be made
to attach daily the collections
at the shops.

On the receipt
of the above order, the
Amildar issued a notice, dated 7.1.93 paper No 189 (V. file)
to Venkatachaliah in-
forming him of the above
order and also directed
the toddy Inspectors, Annajee Rao
and Kallaiya respectively
to attach (1) the daily collections (Ra per No 1888
at the several shops
and

annual. The six takrar petitions as noted below, protesting against the attachment of some of the lands on the ground of alienation by sale, mortgage or otherwise, are herewith submitted for perusal.

Paper No in V. file	Name of Takyardar and date of petn	Subject
1) 229.	Venkatappa 16.1.93	that a house in Harohally attached as belonging to Venkatachalah, is
2) 230	Hombaiya 20.1.93.	that a portion of land No 258 of Harohally (attached) was sold to him in 1891 by Krishnappa Naik
3) 231	Setty Puttanna 21.1.93	that another portion of the above said No 258, was sold to him in 1892 by Krishnappa Naik, by a duly registered deed
4) 233.	Chik Narasimiah 4.3.93	that land No 208 of Timma Sandra dalde village, was first mortgaged to him in 1889 and subsequently Sold in 1891 for Rs 80/-

said to) paper Nos 232 and 234.

Tirumala Naik (petr)
25.1.93

that the lands in Yadamadu in his patta and some other lands were his own and that either Krishnappa Naik or Ramakrishnappa had no claim in respect of them.

N.B. Paper No 279 (Ver. file), is the list of attached lands giving also the nature of the Taluqdar and the Amildar's remarks thereon. The last item No 16 relates to the lands in dispute.

Orders are solicited as to the disposal of the attached properties".

4) The Asst Comr thereupon called for a further report on 25.5.93 as to (1) whether notices were issued to the parties concerned demanding the arrears due from Venkatachaliah and whether the attachment was made in their presence, after allowing 15 days' time from the serving of the notice as required

by

that Krishnappa Naik and Ramakrishnappa were his own brothers; but that Krishnappa Naik was given in adoption to the petr's uncle Dodda Narana Naik and that Ramakrishnappa had sold his hulc to the petr in 1875. The petr had produced in this connection one documents, which is a receipt dated 20.6.1875 written on one anna stamp paper, executed by Ramakrishnappa in favor of the petr, giving up all hulc to the ancestral lands noted in the documents, on account of Rs 300/- received from the petr in the list of lands and properties referred to in the said receipt, the lands of gedamadu in question

vide Slip. A.
Paper No. 105

question find a place.
The remark on the Stamp
paper however, shows
that the said paper was
sold to Desappa Naik
on 5.6.1875, (but not to the executor)

7) On the prayer of
Venkatachaliah and
Krishnappa Naik he to
stay sale of the attached
lands pending disposal of
the appeal to Excise Court
in re the question of toddy
contract the Dy Commissioner
ordered on 10.9.94, as below × paper No 8b

"The Sale will not be
~~cancelled~~ stopped unless
the petrs pay the arrears
which will, pending dis
posal of appeal by the
Excise Court be held in
deposit". This order was
communicated to the Amildar
by the Asst Court's No 55 dated 10.9.94

other lands, for Rs 300
to the petr and had given
a receipt to that effect
on 20.6.1873. The petr
Timmala Naik prays
on the above ground for
release of the said lands
from attachment. He
has produced the receipt
relied upon by him. This
receipt purports to be
a regular deed but
such a paper, only one anna
stamp paper (already dealt
with in the previous para 6)
was not sold to the executor
ab all but to Devappa
Naik Venkatachaliah
to the Son-in-law and
Ramakrishnappa (Surety)
our brother, of the petr
These persons seem to
have joined together to
Save

cause the attached properties
and to throw obstacles
in the way of collecting the
arrears. The other two
documents produced by
the same petr in respect
of some other lands, which
both of which are likewise
insufficiently stamped
and unregistered) show
beyond doubt that they
are worthy of being rejected
only. I hold that the petr's
contention is invalid and
have issued orders for
the sale of the attached
lands as per remark
in the list

paper No. 279

9) The lands were
ordered to be sold and the
sale is others were issued Papers Nos. 80, 81, 82
on 24.11.94. Paper No. 82
very file, is the Sale is other
in respect of the lands

under takrar (the Sale date fixed being 27.12.94). These lands were sold (only $\frac{2}{3}$ rd Share) on 27.12.94 for Rs 280 to one Thim-mappa

paper No 116

10) The Amildar on 20.1.95, No 184, again reported to the Dy Commr as follows after the Sales were held:—

"Some of the lands attached were sold, as detailed below, on the dates Specified in the ichitnars

Amount fetched at the Sale	Name of purcha-ser	properly Sold.
(1) Rs 135	Patta Setti	Sirdar, Venkatachalich's house.
(2) Rs 520	Dabbi Narana-ppa	wet land, maji No 548, with produce, belonging to Surety, Malavalli Narasimiah.
Rs 50	— do —	deposit produced by the purcha-ser. As the full deposit ($\frac{1}{4}$ of 520) viz 135 was

not paid and as per desire of the purchaser, the land was resold

Rs 470. Venkatappa. purchaser at the 2nd Sale.

(3) dryland No 280 near Harohally of Survey chik Narasimiah son of Narasimiah	purchaser chickanna.	Rs 60
(4) garden land No 614 belonging to Survey Ramakrishnaiya's share	Siddaiya	50
(5) 2/3 share in vedamadu lands under division, of Ramakrishnappa and Krishnappa Naik	Thimmappa	280
(6) drylands Nos 1, 47, 48 and produce in Goligahalli belonging to Ramakrishnappa	Ananaiya	Rs 301
	Total.	Rs 1346-0-0

Out of this amount Rs 1179 have been collected and held in deposit in the Taluk Treasury. The Sales took place on 26, 27 and 27th December 1894. The balance of Sale amount will also be collected and held in deposit in due course As the whole amount of arrears had been realised, the other lands attached were not sold. After the lands were attached and

and before the Sale thereof Interim petitions had been received from the persons already referred to ~~in~~ Tirumala Naik The three documents produced by Tirumala Naik (1), viz the receipt already referred to in respect of 2 Edamadu lands and 2 others in respect of other lands (already dealt with in the precis) Seem to be suspicious The arrears due from a long time remain uncollected owing to the above futile Interims".

11) The Dy Collr on 26/9/98 returned the papers to the Amildar with the remark that the Same should be solved.

submitted to the Sub-Div officer
who had the jurisdiction
in this matter. The
Amildar thereupon, ~ paper No 120
(report No 194 dated 8.2.95)
submitted the records to the
Sub-Div officer together
with a statement (paper
No 121 V. file) about the
Sale of the lands, the value
fetched and other particulars

1) The Sub-Div officer Paper No 134
on 16.4.95 (No 268) ordered
as follows "The records
do not contain any papers
to show whether notices
were issued to the Sureties
A notice was has been served only on
Venkatachalaih declaration
of forfeiture and notices
of the same have not
been received to in this
case

It was not necessary to have sold some lands which neither belonged to the defaulter nor his Sureties Some lands actually belonging to the defaulter and the sureties have not been sold It appears that these were left unsold, as the full arrears were realized. It seems proper to sell these lands, if the sale of any of the lands now held are is set aside. The records are returned with some other papers subsequently received.

13) Meanwhile, the Govt passed final

final orders on the appeal
of Venkatachaliah (Pro
No. 7234-5/Ex-265 dated 2.2.98), Serial No. 20 of this office file,
remitting a further sum
of Rs 578.12.5 in favor of
the contractor and on the
receipt of this Govt order
in the Dy Comrs office,
order dated 9.2.98 was paper No. 297 Ver file
issued to the Sub. Div. office
by the Dy Comrs to the
effect, that after deducting
Rs 578.12.5, a sum of Rs 988/-
was still due; that out
of the deposit held in the
Taluk Treasury realised
from the sale of the
lands already held, Rs 530
had to be paid back
as the sales of two lands,
(items Nos 2 and 3 referred to
in para 10 of the precis)
Nos 4 and 280 which fetched Rs 470/-

orders previously received dated 4.8.93 No 19, an additional item of Rs 140 ($\frac{1}{3}$ share of Krishnappa Naik) in Yedawadu lands had to be set aside. Orders are solicited as to which order is to be given effect to. There would still be left a balance out of the deposit amount, to be given back to the parties by cancelling some sales, as more money than Rs 588 had been realised. The hukum dated 2.2.98 Rs 578-12-5 alone is said to have been remitted but Rs 600 had been already remitted (G.O dated 29.9.94) and this is

is not referred to in the said (Sub Dy. Asst. Commr's) order of 2.2.98. Orders are solicited as to whether both the items have to be taken into account or only the last item

(13) The above papers were referred to the Dy. Commr, who on 9.7.98 passed final orders as follows

Paper No 298/4

Rs 100 as per G.O. dated 29.9.94 and Rs 578.12.5 as per order dated 2.2.98, total Rs 978.12.5 should be remitted. Out of the amount now held in deposit realised by Sale, viz Rs 1346/-, Rs 588 has to be adjusted towards the arrears due and only after balance, (viz) Rs 758 (1346-588) the four items as per margin amounting to Rs 678/- should be

1) Rs 470 realised from Venkatappa - item No (2) para 10 of the precis.
2) Rs 50. realised from Dabbi Narayanappa, as deposit in the 1st Sale of the above land
3) Rs 140. half of Rs 280/- realised from Thimmappa, as 1/3 share of Ramakrishnappa alone in gedamadlu lands had been held validly by Sub Dy. Asst. Commr.
4) Rs 15. recovered from Chickanna as the 1st deposit for land No 280 sold to him for Rs 60.

Total Rs 675.

The Sub Dn appd
knows how that
Krishnappa Naik had
no right to any portion
of the land on account
of his adoption into
another family &
confirmed the Sale
of only the 1/3 share
belonging to Ramakrishnappa
The petn alleges
that his brother Rama-
krishnappa owned
no share in the land
having sold his share
to the petn in 1875
and produces a pr one entry
stamped paper in favour
of them The relation-
ship of the parties

in paper bearing

& the jurisdiction of
an indenture stamped & unregistered
deed of sale are suggestive
of fraud & collusion &
defeat the revenue
interests of govt. The
petrs contention will
be rejected & the
appeal dismissed

8/9/03

P.S. If the Courts had no
jurisdiction, as the petrs want
to make out, the amount
must have been petty
a lot or worse & have
accepted such terms

Subd-

The claim is for the restoration of a 1/3 of the Share of the maji nos 118, 119, 120, & 121 Hulgaval, 75, 87, 110 Kushiki in the Yedanadu village Kan Kanhalli Tk & the Petitioner Thirumal Naik

It was these lands bearing the same maji numbers that were sold in Satisfaction of the arrears of Excise revenue Caused through the default of the Toddy Contractor Venkatachallia & his sureties Ram Krishniah and Krishnappa Naik in the Year 1892-93, as can be verified from the perusal of paper no 279 of the Ver Records and as noted on page 8 of the Precis of the Case. A

The Sale "ishthyar" for 2/3 of the lands above noted was issued vide paper no 82 of the Vern: records, under the belief that it was the share belonging to Ram Krishnappa & Krishnappa naik. B

As can be seen from the Sale Patti vide paper no 116. (Ver. Records) 2/3 of the Sand lands were sold on 27.11.1894 for Rs 280 to one Gurikar Thimappa

As a result of the Jaktarar of the present petitioner on those occasions when the 2/3 share of the Magi was sold in the Jedanadu village ~~village~~ proceeded against for the satisfaction of the arrears of Excise Revenue, sale of 1/3 share of it, as belonging to Krishnappa was set aside, as it was ~~found~~ established that Krishnappa had no right in it

Thus only 1/3 of the share of the lands as belonging to Ram Krishnappa was confirmed (vide paper no 79) in the face of the allegation of the petitioner Thimmal Naick to the effect for the share of Ram Krishnaiah's land had been sold to him ~~for~~ in 1875 for Rs 300/- and that he was the Sole Pattadar

Orders for phoding the land and 1/3 of it being ~~to~~ made over to the purchaser Gurikar Thimappa, ~~was~~

40

Draft-out ~~S Lee~~
for Asst

12/9/03

18/9/3

The Dewan
through the 2nd
Counsellor

I quite agree that the Petitioner has made out no case and that his Petition should be rejected.

16/9/03

RD 17-9-03
engrossed
13006.

For Legislative Secretary
SM. 47-00

18/9/03

the person. The petr explains the delay by stating that he went to Nagpore to attend his brother who was ill

(Sd) V. R. T. 12-4-02

Rep (in the file) V 860 01-02

S.K.

Exct B

13/5/02

Excise Branch
Please peruse references

14-5-02

4-7-99-97-98. Instl ccs

16/5/02

Submitted.

Stamp (Rupees Two). Suffic.

Delay explained (vide stat)

Secy's note on the petn)

The facts are not clear from the petn and the file set up.

17-5-02

Rep with records

17/5/02

Dy Sec & Exct Instr

Engd
23/5/02

A 86 of 02-03
190

No. 2881 Serial No.

Name of Petitioner Tirumala nayak

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankanhalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 12th April 190

Date of Receipt 12th April 190

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Five

ABSTRACT

1. This is a petition for the restoration of a portion of his lands which was made over to one gunka Chicka Timmappa in February 1900 for the reason detailed below; and also for

the payment of compensation for the loss of two years' crops in consequence of portion equalling one third of the petitioner's holding was made over in February 1900 on the alleged ground that ~~that~~ portion belonged to the petitioners' brother who had stood as jamin to a toddy contractor Venkatachellam (1902-1903 ~~1902-1903~~); and that the land was sold in 1894 and bought by the above gurkar Chicka Timmappa, on default

of ~~[illegible]~~ paying the
contract money
2 On this, the petitioner
to the Amildar, but
received no endorsement
So, the petitioner says,
he gave a petition to
the Survey Supt. on 3 Sept
1900, which was returned
in the latters Endorsement
No 9976 dated 12/9/1900
requiring the Amildars
Endorsement This last
was obtained in the
Amildars Endorsement
No 1258 dated 26/1/1901
and was to the effect
that the Amuldar was
not competent to pass
any order on this
subject, as the Govt.

had authorised the sale. This Endorsement in the petitioner's petition to the Survey Supt who in his Endorsement No 96 dated 16/10/1901 has refused to pass any orders, as the matter has been disposed of by Govt.

3. The petitioner declares that there is no connexion between the land and his brother who stood jamin for the defaulting toddy contractor, ie, the land was his own self acquisition as is stated in his petition to Survey Supt on which Survey Supt's En-

endorsement No 9976 was
passed (referred to above).
The petitioner encloses
~~three~~ two endorsements
to show his title to
the land in question
viz (a) The taluk Amil
dar's Endorsement No 134
dated 10/8/1883 directing
whether he would cultivate the land or hand
it over to the darkasta
one Nanyappa Shanbhog
for cultivation, the
land therein being merely
a pasture ground.
(b). The Survey Dy Supt's En-
dorsement No 706 dated
7/5/1897 granting the
pattah to the petitioner
for the whole survey
number 25

(This was altered owing to the division of 8 acres being given to Madkempa)

4. The petitioner points out that if the facts were as stated in the Amildar's order in Feb 1900, the matter should have been brought to the notice of Survey Supt at the time of the settlement in January 1897 as Chicka Timma Mappa was present then done This was not done, nor did the Sheristdar nor the Amildar brought forward the alleged fact to the Consideration of the Survey Supt

5 The petitioner further points out that he brought the lands into ābād and that the Govt took the kandayam for three years since 1897.

The petitioner says that when the lands were taken from him and given to Chicka Timmappa he was not given notice.

Enclosures

1. Survey Supt's Endorsement No 96 dated 16/10/1901 stating that no orders could issue from this dept as the matter had been disposed of by Govt.

It is curious to observe in this endorsement that the petitioner prayed for the restoration of his land deducting 8 acres given away to Chicka Timmappa (as

the endorsement reads, but probably which is meant for Nadi Kempa referred to in the first three lines on p6 of this abstract)

2. Survey Dy Supt's Endorsement No 106 dated 7/5/1897 stating the whole survey no 25 belongs to petitioner

3. Anekal Amildar's Endorsement No 134 dated 10/8/1883 asking whether the petitioner would cultivate or give it to the dasdar (See @ p 5 of the abstract)

4. Survey Supt's Endorsement No 9976 dated 12/9/1900 requisitioning the Amildar's Endorsement

5. Kankanhalli Amildar's Endorsement No 1268 dated 26/1/1901 stating his inability to consider the case, as the sale had been authorised by the superior authorities

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 2881
DATE 12-4-1902

12-4-1902

1602

1-2nd Rupee stamp affd.

2nd

In the Hon'ble
The Petitioner claim
the delay by stating
that he went to
Mysore on the
12/4/02

ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਪ੍ਰਾਇਮਰੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਪੜ੍ਹਦੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਮੁਫ਼ਤ ਵਰਦੀਆਂ ਵੰਡਣ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਨਿਯਮ ਅਤੇ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਪ੍ਰਾਇਮਰੀ ਸਕੂਲਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਪੜ੍ਹਦੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਹਰ ਸਾਲ ਮੁਫ਼ਤ ਵਰਦੀਆਂ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਜਾਂਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਸ ਸਕੀਮ ਦਾ ਮੰਤਵ ਗ਼ਰੀਬ ਪਰਿਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਬੱਚਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਬਰਾਬਰੀ ਦੀ ਭਾਵਨਾ ਨਾਲ ਪੜ੍ਹਾਈ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਉਤਸ਼ਾਹਿਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਸਕੀਮ ਅਧੀਨ ਹਰ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਸਾਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਦੋ ਜੋੜੇ ਵਰਦੀ ਦੇ ਅਤੇ ਇੱਕ ਜੋੜਾ ਜੁੱਤੀ ਦਾ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ।

ਵਰਦੀ ਦਾ ਰੰਗ ਅਤੇ ਨਮੂਨਾ ਸਕੂਲ ਮੈਨੇਜਮੈਂਟ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦੀ ਸਲਾਹ ਨਾਲ ਤੈਅ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ। ਵਰਦੀ ਦਾ ਕੱਪੜਾ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਨਿਰਧਾਰਤ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਦੁਕਾਨਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਹੀ ਖ਼ਰੀਦਿਆ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ। ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਮੁਖੀ ਦੀ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰੀ ਹੋਵੇਗੀ ਕਿ ਵਰਦੀ ਦੀ ਸਿਲਾਈ ਸਮੇਂ ਸਿਰ ਮੁਕੰਮਲ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਵਰਦੀ ਤੋਂ ਵਾਂਝਾ ਨਾ ਰਹਿਣ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ।

ਵਰਦੀ ਵੰਡਣ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਪਾਰਦਰਸ਼ੀ ਢੰਗ ਨਾਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ। ਹਰ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਵਰਦੀ ਲੈਣ ਸਮੇਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਸਤਖ਼ਤ ਜਾਂ ਅੰਗੂਠਾ ਲਗਾਉਣਾ ਪਵੇਗਾ। ਜੇ ਕੋਈ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਕਿਸੇ ਕਾਰਨ ਵਰਦੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਲੈ ਸਕਦਾ, ਤਾਂ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਮਾਪੇ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਦੇ ਕੇ ਬਾਅਦ ਵਿੱਚ ਵਰਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਨ।

ਜੇ ਕੋਈ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਵਰਦੀ ਜਾਣਬੁੱਝ ਕੇ ਖ਼ਰਾਬ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਜਾਂ ਗੁਆ ਲੈਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਉਸ ਤੋਂ ਵਰਦੀ ਦੀ ਕੀਮਤ ਵਸੂਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ। ਇਸ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਫ਼ੈਸਲਾ ਸਕੂਲ ਮੁਖੀ ਅਤੇ ਅਧਿਆਪਕਾਂ ਦੀ ਇੱਕ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਕਰੇਗੀ। ਵਰਦੀ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਦਿਨਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਲਈ ਹੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਮੁਖੀ ਹਰ ਤਿਮਾਹੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਇੱਕ ਵਾਰ ਵਰਦੀ ਦੀ ਵੰਡ ਦੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੇਗਾ। ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਵਿੱਚ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਗਿਣਤੀ, ਵੰਡੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ ਵਰਦੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਗਿਣਤੀ ਅਤੇ ਬਕਾਇਆ ਵਰਦੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਦਰਜ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ। ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੀ ਗੜਬੜੀ ਦੀ ਸੂਰਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ।

ਸਾਲਿਕ ਸ਼ਹਰਯਾਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਦਾ ਨਾਲ ਸਾਲਿਕ ਸ਼ਹਰਯਾਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਦੀ

34

31

2513
78

ಸಂ||

ರವ್ಯೆಕರ್.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಆಮಿಾಲರಿಗೆ

ಹುಕ್ಕುಂ

ಬಾಜೂದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿ ಇರುವ ಹುಕುಮಿಗೆ

ಇದುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಜವಾಬು ಬರದೇ ಇರುವದರಿಂದ

ಸಾವಕಾಶವಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಜಾಯಿಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರಿ

ಟಪಾಲಿಗೆ ಜವಾಬನ್ನಿನಿಸಿ ರಿಪ್ರೋರ್ಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ನಮ್ಮ ನೇ ನಂಬರು ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ಹುಕ್ಕುಂ

ವಿಷಯ.-

15/9/99

for Deputy Commissioner.

Dated 3/7/1899.

Pet 2149 Enc 6 p Enc 2 p
25 26.5.1902

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

S.O. No. 1301 Serial No 2
S.O. 2227/02

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition No. 2881 dated 12 April 1902 received at the Dewan's Office from Sirumala Naik of Harohalli, Kankanhalli Taluk, complaining that a portion of his land in Yedamadu village has been made over to Patel Chicka Timmappa

is forwarded, together with its Five enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

Asst

For Secretary.

BANGALORE,
23 May 1902
26

OFFICE OF THE
Regd. No. 55-88.
20 NOV. 1902
DEWAN OF MYSORE

Ref 315 1890-03

FROM The Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To Serial No 3
The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore
Rev & Genl Depts

Dated 18th } November 1902
Despatched 19th }
Received

General No.

D. No. 522

Enclosure No. 2 fls

Secretary's Official
Memo No. Pet/2149
of 26th May 1902.

Submitting a report on the petition of Thimmala Naik re a portion of his lands in Yedamadu village, Kaukanhalli Sabk being made over to one Gunikara Thimmappa.

1/ Precis (Cash)
2/ Are the records relating to the sale in these papers?
3/ Search but contd not found them
24/12/02

Note
20 11 02
Refers putting.
22/11 Subd.
24.11.02.

Precis 30.1.03.
Precis taken on
hand 1.2.03
accounts & other
work attended
to.

Subd
a
Subd write a precis ✕ yes the
Sale records are in the
file
24/2/03.
23

D. No 524

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 18th November 1902

From,

H. H. Sparkes Esquire,

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To,

H. V. Nanjundayya Esquire,
Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue Genl Depts.

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memo No Pol 2149 of the 26th May 1902, Calling for a report on the petition of Timmala Naik, regarding a portion of his lands in Yedamadu village, Kasaba hobli Dalu[illegible] being made over to one Gurukar Thimmappa, I have the honor to state that; the Complaint relates

2

relates to the sale of the lands in the enjoyment of the petitioner in whose name the patta also stood. The circumstances that led to its sale is explained below:

One Venkatachelliah of Kankanhalli, who had acquired the right of drawing and vending toddy of the Satnur shop on an annual Rental of Rs 3060/- for the year 1892-93 defaulted monthly regular payments. The property of the defaulter as also that of the sureties was proceeded against. The petitioner's land which included 2 shares of the sureties (Ramakrishniah & Krishnappa Hack) had to be attached and was sold at the sale held on 27th December 1894 for Rs 280/- to one Ijwikar

Thimmappa

Thimmappa, the Salebeing Con-
firmed only to the shares of the
sureties. The sureties and the
Toddy Contractor made representa-
tions to Government urging
the Cancellation of the sale on
grounds urged therein. Govern-
-ment, on perusing the records
and upon the recommendation
of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore, sanctioned a re-
-mission of Rs 978-12-5, (Rs 400/=
and Rs 578-12-5 in No $\frac{5853-4}{R\ 898}$
dated 29th September 1894 and
No $\frac{7234-5}{Ex\ 265}$ dated 2nd February
1898 respectively), excluding
this amount of Remission there
still remained a sum of Rs 588/=
to be recovered. For the satis-
-faction of this balance, the
sale of certain items was Con-
firmed in which was in-
cluded the sale of so much

of

sub division and not others.

4. The petition with its enclosures is herewith returned together with the two files relating to the present dispute, as also that relating to the sale of properties towards the recovery of toddy revenue.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

H. H. Sparke

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

is untenable and the appeal dismissed.

18/9/13
Secretary

19/9/13

045·92

17·1+·83

No. The Dy Com.r Bangalore &c
returning the papers.
The Executive Comm.r in Mysore

5

No. 285
E47-9-97.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

The 23rd Sept 1903

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Thirumal Naick of Harohalli village in the Kankanhalli Taluk

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2881 dated 12th April 1902 praying that one-third share in certain lands in the Yedamadu village sold as belonging to one Ramkrishniah — a defaulting Zody Contractor Venkatachellah, in satisfaction of an arrear of Excise revenue may be ~~not~~ restored to him and that the Confirmation of their sale by the Dy Comr Bangalore may be annulled on the ground that Ramakrishniah had no right to the lands.

~~Petitioner is informed that~~

Petitioner is informed that his contention that Ramkrishniah did not possess 1/3 share in the lands in question is untenable and that the appeal is therefore rejected.

By Order,

Secretary

12/9/03